HUDD VICTOR

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MAY 1 0 2013

MICHAELE, KUNZ, Clerk
By Dep. Clerk

VICTOR ALVARADO 244 FIFTH AVENUE, FLOOR 2 NEW YORK, NY 10001-7945

**CIVIL ACTION** 

Plaintiff

V.

THE CITY OF CHESTER 1 FOURTH STREET CHESTER, PA 19013 -and-

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION t/d/b/a AMTRAK 50 MASSACHUSSETTS AVENUE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 -and-

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION: 400 NORTH STREET HARRISBURG, PA 17120

Defendants

NO.: 13 2567

#### **COMPLAINT**

#### I. PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Victor Alvarado, is an adult individual and a citizen and resident of the State of New York, residing therein at 244 Fifth Avenue, Floor 2, New York, NY 10001-7945.
- 2. The City of Chester is a Pennsylvania municipality and a local agency, as defined in Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act, 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8501 et.seq., organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with a principal place of business at 1 Fourth Street, Chester, PA 19013.

- 3. Pursuant to the provisions of 42 Pa.C.S.A § 5522, Plaintiff has placed the Defendant the City of Chester on notice of his injuries. (See, Letter, dated October 20, 2011, attached as Exhibit "A").
- 4. National Railroad Passenger Corporation, t/d/b/a AMTRAK (hereinafter "AMTRAK") is a federally chartered common carrier corporation, existing and organized pursuant to an Act of Congress, 49 U.S.C. § 24101 et. seq., with a principal place of business at 50 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20002.
- 5. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Transportation (hereinafter "Penndot") is a Pennsylvania Commonwealth Agency as defined by the Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act, 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8501 et.seq., with a principal place of business at 400 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120.
- 6. Pursuant to the provisions of 42 Pa.C.S.A § 5522, Plaintiff has placed Defendant Penndot on notice of his injuries. (See, Letter, dated October 20, 2011, attached as Exhibit "B")

#### II. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

- 7. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1349 because Defendant Amtrak is a federally chartered corporation, created by an Act of Congress, 49 U.S.C. § 24101 et seq with Federal Government owing more than fifty percent of the stock.
- 8. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania also has original jurisdiction over this action as the parties are diverse, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332A and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00.
  - 9. The Plaintiff is resident of the State of New York.

- 10. Defendant, the City of Chester, maintains a principal place of business in the City of Chester, Pennsylvania.
- 11. Defendant Amtrak is a citizen of the District of Columbia as it maintains a principal place of business in Washington, D.C.
- 12. Defendant Pennsylvania Department of Transportation is a State Agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and hence is a citizen of Pennsylvania.

#### III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 13. At all times material hereto, one or more of the above Defendants owned, operated, maintained and/or otherwise controlled a railroad bridge, located at or near the intersection of Fifth and Upland Streets in the City of Chester, Pennsylvania.
- 14. Based on information and belief, one or more of the above Defendants were also responsible for placing, maintaining and otherwise controlling height clearance traffic signs, designed and intended to notify drivers of tall vehicles, such as tractor trailers of the height clearance of the subject bridge/underpass and located near the approach to the subject railroad bridge.
- 15. On June 1, 2011 Plaintiff Victor Alvarado was the operator of a 2006 Century Freightliner Tractor, proceeding southbound on Upland Street, approaching the Amtrak's Fifth Street underpass.
- 16. As Victor Alvarado began to drive under the underpass, the exhaust pipes of his truck struck the underside of the bridge, causing Mr. Alvarado to sustain severe personal injuries which are further described below.

# <u>COUNT I</u> <u>PLAINTIFF VICTOR ALVARADO V. DEFENDANT CITY OF CHESTER</u>

- 17. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the preceding paragraphs by reference as though stated in full herein.
- 18. The negligence of Defendant, The City of Chester, consisted of but was not limited to the following:
  - a. Failing to properly maintain the subject railroad bridge;
  - Failing to ensure that there was proper street signage, warning motorists of the height of the bridge;
  - c. Failing to ensure that the missing bridge height sign was replaced;
  - d. Failing to prevent vandalism and/or removal of bridge height signs;
  - e. Failing to warn Plaintiff and other motorists of the dangers presented by the low clearance of the bridge;
  - f. Failing to erect, maintain and/or secure an advance information sign near the intersection nearest the end of the restricted bridge to allow drivers such as Plaintiff to avoid the height restricted bridge;
  - g. Creating a nuisance on a public highway;
  - h. Failing to exercise due care in fixing, replacing and/or maintaining the signage warning motorists as to the height of the bridge;
  - Failing to notify appropriate entities, parties, individuals and/or authority and/or expertise, to fix or replace or place the height clearance signage approaching the bridge.

- 19. The aforesaid negligence of Defendant The City of Chester resulted in Plaintiff Victor Alvarado sustaining severe personal injuries which include but are not limited to the following:
  - a. L5-S1 disc bulge with anular tear;
  - b. Regional pain syndrome;
  - c. Traumatically induced urinary incontinence;
  - d. Left rotator cuff tear
  - e. Severe pain in his neck, back and left shoulder;
  - f. Neuritis and/or radiculitis of the thoracic and lumbosacral spine;
  - g. Pain and suffering;
  - h. Damage to his nerves and nervous system;
  - i. Medical bills, past, present and future;
  - i. Lost earnings and lost earning capacity.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter Judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendants.

# COUNT II PLAINTIFF VICTOR ALVARADO V. DEFENDANT AMTRAK

- 20. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as though stated in full herein.
- The negligence of Defendant Amtrak consisted of but is not limited to the following:
  - a. Failing to properly maintain the subject railroad bridge;
  - Failing to ensure that there was proper street signage, warning motorists of the height of the bridge;

- c. Failing to ensure that the missing bridge height sign was replaced;
- d. Failing to prevent vandalism and/or removal of bridge height signs;
- e. Failing to warn Plaintiff and other motorists of the dangers presented by the low clearance of the bridge;
- f. Failing to erect, maintain and/or secure an advance information sign near the intersection nearest the end of the restricted bridge to allow drivers such as Plaintiff to avoid the height restricted bridge;
- g. Creating a nuisance on a public highway;
- h. Failing to exercise due care in fixing, replacing and/or maintaining the signage warning motorists as to the height of the bridge;
- i. Failing to notify appropriate entities, parties, individuals and/or authority and/or expertise, to fix or replace or place the height clearance signage approaching the bridge.
- 22. As a result of the aforesaid negligence of Defendant Amtrak, Plaintiff sustained injuries and damages as described in Paragraph 19 above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter Judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendants.

#### <u>COUNT III</u> <u>PLAINTIFF VICTOR ALVARADO V. DEFENDANT PENNDOT</u>

- 23. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as though stated in full herein.
- 24. The negligence and carelessness of Defendant Penndot consisted of but was not limited to the following:
  - a. Failing to properly maintain the subject railroad bridge;

- Failing to ensure that there was proper street signage, warning motorists of the height of the bridge;
- c. Failing to ensure that the missing bridge height sign was replaced;
- d. Failing to prevent vandalism and/or removal of bridge height signs;
- e. Failing to warn Plaintiff and other motorists of the dangers presented by the low clearance of the bridge;
- f. Failing to erect, maintain and/or secure an advance information sign near the intersection nearest the end of the restricted bridge to allow drivers such as Plaintiff to avoid the height restricted bridge;
- g. Creating a nuisance on a public highway;
- h. Failing to exercise due care in fixing, replacing and/or maintaining the signage warning motorists as to the height of the bridge;
- i. Failing to notify appropriate entities, parties, individuals and/or authority and/or expertise, to fix or replace or place the height clearance signage approaching the bridge.
- 25. As a result of the negligence of Defendant Penndot Plaintiff sustained injuries and damages as outlined in Paragraph 19 above.

### Case 2:13-cv-02567-PBT Document 1 Filed 05/10/13 Page 8 of 13

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter Judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendants.

GALFAND BERGER, L.L.P.

BY:

HENRY AMPOLSKY, ESQUIRE 1835 Market Street, Suite 2710

Philadelphia, PA 19103 Phone: (215) 665-1600

(215) 564-2262

Email: hyampolsky@galfandberger.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

# Case 2:12 12 2567-PETV POCUDORER STIFE COF/10/12 Page 9 of 13 2567

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information of the line herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form approach by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE TONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sneet. (SEE-1851 KC)	HONS ON NEXT PAGE OF TH	HIS FORM.)		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Alvarado, Victor			DEFENDANTS The City of Chester National Railroad Pas Commonwealth of Pe	ssenger Corporation 13	2567
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff ou	t of state	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	
(E.	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES)	NOTE:	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF IN LAND CONDEMNATION CONDEMNA	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Felephone Numbe	r	Attorneys (If Known)	THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL	VED.
Galfand Berger, LLP	hiladelphia, PA 19103	/			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only) III.	CITIZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	
U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not	a Party)		TF DEF  Incorporated or Pri  of Business In T	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF incipal Place
2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	of Business In A	Another State
			Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box O	Only)			
CONTRACT		RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust
<ul> <li>☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment</li> </ul>	Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		820 Copyrights	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
(Excludes Veterans)  ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	Liability _PERSONAL PROPERTY	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY  861 HIA (1395ff)	490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits		☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management	862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	Exchange  890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	380 Other Personal Property Damage	Relations  740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters
196 Franchise	Injury  362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability	751 Family and Medical Leave Act	003 KSI (403(g))	895 Freedom of Information
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act/Review or Appeal of
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 442 Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate		or Defendant)  ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	Agency Decision  950 Constitutionality of
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence		26 USC 7609	State Statutes
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities	530 General 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION		
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities	Other:  540 Mandamus & Other	☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration		
	Other  448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	Actions		
	- 446 Education	560 Civil Detainee -			
		Conditions of Confinement			
	moved from 📙 3 Rem	nanded from 4		sferred from   6 Multidis her District Litigatio	
VI. CAUSE OF	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu 28 U.S.C. section 1332	-	g (Do not cite jurisdictional statut	tes unless diversity):	
ACTION	Brief description of caus	se:			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	<del></del>	A CLASS ACTION	g from improper signage on rail DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY		JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	MAY 1 0 2013
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTORNE	Y OF RECORD		
D.III L		,((			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT# AM	MOUNT	APPLYING (EP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE

# Case 2:13-cv-02567-PENITED STATES PISTRICT 69/18/13 Page 10 of 13

Address of Plaintiff:244 Fifth Avenue Flor 12 New York, N.Y. 10001-7945	
Address of Defendant: 1 Fourth Street, Chester, PA 19013: 50 Massachussetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20002; 400 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 171 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Fifth and Upland Street, Chester, PA  (Use Reverse Side Space)  Does this case involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of 16 stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  RELATED CASE, IF ANY:  Case Number: Judge  Date Terminated:  Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:  1. Is this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No.  No.  No.  No.  No.  No.  TVIL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  A. Federal Question Cases:  1. Insurance Contract, and Other Contracts  1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	67
face of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Fifth and Upland Street, Chester, PA  (Use Reverse Side Space)  (Use Reverse Side Space)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (See this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (See this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  (Fig. 1)  (Fig. 1)  (Fig. 2)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 2)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 2)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 3)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 4)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 4)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 4)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Fig. 4)  (Fig.	120
Space)  (Use Reverse Side  Space)  (Use Reverse Side  Space)  (Use Reverse Side  (Use Reverse Side  Space)  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  (Ose this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  ELATED CASE. IF ANY:  are Number:  Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes   No   No    No	120
ces this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of ys stock?  (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  The property of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance wit	For Addition
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))  Pes  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N	
oes this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  ### ### ############################	
ELATED CASE, IF ANY:  ase Number:  Judge  divid cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:  Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes \top No \top Yes \top Yes \top No \top Yes \top Yes \top No \top Yes \top Ye	
ase Number:	
ivil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:  Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes \top No \top Obes this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes \top No \top Obes this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  IVIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I.   Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No  Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No  Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  IVIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No  Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No  Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  No  WIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  IVIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  IVIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  No VILI: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  No  VIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  I. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  No  VIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  I. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
VIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
VIL: (Place _ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)  Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  I. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	Yes
. Federal Question Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
Federal Question Cases:  B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contract	
	acts
2.	
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. ☐ Assault, Defamation	
Antitrust  4. Marine Personal Injury	
5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	- ^
5.   Labor-Management Relations  6.   Other Personal Injury (Please specify)	у)
7. Civil Rights Products Liability	
8.   Habeas Corpus	
D. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases  9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases	
0. ☐ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify)	)
. All other Federal Question Cases  (Please specify)	
A D DIED A TION CEDEVACION	
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category)	
Henry Yampolsky, counsel of record do h	
<ul> <li>Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the 50,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;</li> </ul>	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	0 TO()
20021	3
DATE: Henry Yampolsky Attorney I.D.	
Attorney-at-Law  Attorney-at-Law  NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	

ATE:		200213
W. (00 (5/0012)	Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
V. 609 (5/2012)		
	$a_{ij}$	
	il Propins	
	t ,	
	*	
	· i	
	7. A	
	•	
	3 4 7	
	1. Francisco (1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	
	** > *	
	· ·	
	• •	

## Case 2:13-cv-02567-PBT Document 1 Filed 05/10/13 Page 12 of 13

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA



## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Oat	R Attorney-at-lav	W		Attorney for	
	5 18 13 Henry Yam	npolsky		MAY Plaintiff	1 0 2013
(f)	Standard Management — Cases that do not fall into an	ny one of the other	r tracks.		( )
	the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detaile management cases.)	ed explanation of s	special		( )
	Special Management — Cases that do not fall into track commonly referred to as complex and that need speci	_			
	Asbestos — Cases involving claims for personal injury exposure to asbestos.	or property dama	ge from		( )
(c)	Arbitration — Cases required to be designated for arbit	tration under Loca	d Civil Rule 53.2.		
	Social Security — Cases requesting review of a decision and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security I	-	of Health		( )
	Habeas Corpus — Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 224	-			( )
SELE	ECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMEN	NT TRACKS:			
parti	designation, that defendant shall, with its first appeales, a Case Management Track Designation Form sponed.			·	
	of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.)				
	ccordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay lagement Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the			•	•
Peni	nsylvania Department of Transportation	:			
	poration t/d/b/a AMTRAK, Commonwealth of	:			
The	City of Chester, National Railroad Passenger	:	NO. 1	3 25	6 <b>7</b>
	ν.	:			
		:			
Alva	ırado, Victor	:	CIVIL ACTION		

Case 2:13-cv-02567-PBT Document 1 Filed 05/10/13 Page 13 of 13

E-Mail Address

(215) 665-1600 hyampolsky@galfandberger.com (215) 564-2262 Telephone

FAX Number

(Civ. 660) 10/02